

**Appl. No.** : **10/508,747**  
**Filed** : **March 4, 2005**

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed February 20, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and further rejected Claims 1-7 as being anticipated or obvious in view of the DeFilippi '783 reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,627,783), the Watson reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,145,824), the Lutz reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,314,290), the DeFilippi '796 reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,941,796) or some combination thereof. The Examiner did, however, indicate that claims 8-10 were objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would otherwise be allowable through if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. By this paper, the Applicant has cancelled Claims 4, 9 and 10 and has amended Claim 1 to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 9 into Claim 1.

With respect to the art of record, DeFilippi '783 does not disclose or teach a system of incrementing an urging structure by means of reciprocating beams. The mechanism of DeFilippi '783 consists of a pair of hydraulic rams linked together and operating in opposite directions. Further, DeFilippi '783 does not disclose a plurality of thrust assemblies arranged at intervals. With respect to the Watson reference, Watson also fails to teach the reciprocating beams provided along their length with thrust assembly as required by Claim 1 as amended. The compacting blade in Watson is activated by a scissors mechanism under the force of a ram 19 acting on the arms of the scissors or by a telescopic ram 13. With respect to Lutz, Lutz generally discloses a moveable bulkhead within a container structure where the bulkhead depends upon a reciprocally moving support structure. With respect to the embodiment of Figure 42, the bulkhead 50 is moved by an attached hydraulic cylinder 176 acting against a number of thrust structures of a fixed rack 178. Again, none of the embodiments in the Lutz reference disclose reciprocating beams provided with thrust assemblies as is claimed by the Applicant. Lastly, with regards to the DeFilippi '796, the Applicant further submits that the DeFilippi '796 also does not disclose the system of incrementing an urging structure by means of reciprocating beams.

**Appl. No.** : **10/508,747**  
**Filed** : **March 4, 2005**

### SUMMARY

Hence, the Applicant believes that Claim 1 as amended is allowable over the art of record as none of the cited references alone or in combination teach this claim. The Applicant further believes that the remaining claims define additional patentable subject matter and are further allowable due to their respective dependency on Claim 1. Should there be any impediment to the prompt allowance of this application that could be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the number shown below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

7/20/07

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Michael H. Trenholm  
Registration No. 37,743  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(951) 781-9231

4040754:lw  
072007